

## **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SOLID WASTE ACTIVITIES**

**December 12, 2005**

**5:00 PM**

Chairman Roy calls the meeting to order.

The Clerk calls the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Thibault, Forest, O'Neil

Messrs.: F. Thomas

Chairman Roy addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, recommending Corcoran Environmental Services as the contractor for yard waste and recycling services for the City.

- a) Agreement for Recycling and Yard Waste Services and for the Construction and Management of a Regional materials Recovery Facility;
- b) Dunbarton Road Facility Ground Lease; and
- c) cost matrix

Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, stated we started the request for proposal process back in May so it has been ongoing for some time now. Back in that May time period we requested proposals. We received four separate proposals. Working with City staff we have evaluated the proposals and we are here tonight to make a recommendation to your Committee and to the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen to proceed with Corcoran Environmental out of Maine. They will be utilizing Pinard Waste, a local firm, to do the collection. The proposal is a two-phase proposal. Initially, they will be doing dual stream recycling on the same day that refuse is picked up. If you remember correctly some of the problems and some of the feedback we have received over the years is why are we doing recycling and yard waste on a separate day, why do we do it bi-weekly and things like that. This proposal tries to address that so initially for approximately the first two years we will continue with dual stream recycling utilizing the bins that we presently have but it will be done on a weekly basis. During that time period Corcoran Environmental will be doing the design and permitting to site a material recovery facility up on Dunbarton Road on a section of a piece of our property at the back end of our drop-off facility. They are proposing to finance and construct

a material recovery facility where they will be able to take recyclables both from within the City and outside the City, process them at the site and market them. As I mentioned, we are moving forward immediately with weekly recycling. One of the things that we had determined from past experience was that we didn't have enough equipment. This proposal is going to be calling for on Day 1 to have four recycling trucks out collecting recyclables where in the past we had three. Also we are going to have four yard waste trucks out there at a minimum on Day 1 to collect yard waste. Under this proposal we are building in a mechanism so that we always have the ability to provide a top level of service. The way we are going to guarantee that is by the ability for us to add on another recycling truck. When we feel that the crews and equipment have reached 95% of their capacity and you are looking at a 10-hour day, there is a set amount where we can add another truck or another crew to make sure that we are maintaining a high level of service. That is a problem that we have had in the past and we are trying to address right now. As part of this proposal, there is going to be a maximum effort done on education. In Year 3 when Corcoran builds their material recovery facility we will also be going to what is known as single stream recycling. Single stream recycling means that you don't need to separate. You will be getting a toter, everybody in the City will be getting a toter and you will put all of your recyclables in that one toter so it makes it a lot easier. With the single stream, the toter and the weekly collections we feel that the recycling participation rate will greatly increase and of course the more we can increase the more we are going to save because we won't need to bring that material to the landfill. The proposal includes as I mentioned leasing Corcoran some land up at our drop-off to build their facility. Right now we are looking at a 30 year lease with two options for an additional 10 years a piece with options to the satisfaction of the City so it is not automatic. If we are still having a good relationship with Corcoran and everything is working out as we anticipated we would extend that lease. We would be getting some lease payments and in addition there is a formula for increases in those lease payments. In addition to the lease payments we are getting, they will also be paying taxes on the facility so we benefit from the fact that we are getting a lease payment and we will be benefiting from the fact that we will be increasing the tax base with this facility. Once the facility is up and running we will receive a host fee of \$2.50/ton for every ton of recycling that comes in to this facility to be processed from outside the City. So there is a host fee, a revenue that is going to be generated for us that is supporting this material recovery facility in our City. This host fee does have a formula built into it so that if Corcoran Environmental starts charging more tips at the facility we would receive a benefit of 10% of that increase. We also will be sharing in revenue sharing. We want this facility to succeed. We want to see Corcoran make money because we will all make money so there is a formula for revenue sharing. The first 15,000 tons of recyclables processed we won't receive any revenue but from 15,000 tons to 50,000 tons we will be receiving 10% of the net profit and from 50,000 up we will be receiving 20% so we are a partner with Corcoran in this

proposal. The proposal in all does provide for means of expanding the services that are under the initial contract that we are recommending be signed. We did obtain a number to provide totter recycling collections downtown. Presently we don't provide that service for the downtown because the volume of recyclables is so great, i.e. cardboard, bottles and whatnot. We do have provisions to move forward with that. Most likely we will look at that very closely once the material recovery facility is built and up and running. That would be the logic to expand the recycling services into the downtown area. What is the term of our contract? We talked about lease arrangements and whatnot. We are going to be contracting...the proposal that we are bringing forward is a 10-year contract with four five-year options to renew. That will bring it up to 30 years, the same period that is the minimum that they are leasing the property. If we decide to extend their lease, we will extend their contract. We didn't want to commit ourselves totally for a 30-year period of time because, quite frankly, 10 years from now somebody may invent something where all of the sudden recyclables are gold. We want to have the flexibility of looking at different options down the road. The way it is set-up right now, Corcoran would have the right of first refusal so say in Year 10 somebody comes up and says we are making widgets out of this stuff now and we want to pay you a lot of money. Well, Corcoran has the right to make those widgets or whatever and utilize our product. One of the problems that we had in the past contract was that our penalties weren't that severe. Now as I mentioned I feel that we are not going to have a drop in service because we have that mechanism built in where we can add more equipment. However, if for whatever reason we do start running into problems where work is not getting done quite frankly the penalty session of this contract is quite severe. If we notify Corcoran of a problem and he does not correct it in a 24 hour period, he is assessed \$100 per incident up to \$1,000 a day. So if he is missing streets and he is not addressing that in a timely manner we have the ability to assess \$1,000/day. That is quite a severe penalty. I don't think it is going to happen because again as I said we have looked at what were the reasons in the past why we had a drop in the level of services and we have the ability to work with the vendor to make sure we maintain that. As far as the cost, the first year cost to do yard waste is \$770,000/year and the first year cost to do weekly dual stream recycling is \$889,800/year. The information that I think we furnished on the agenda or the supplement that you received were spreadsheets and back-up sheets that show the first year's cost and as we go down the road it makes some assumptions as far as what is going to be generated out of that facility, what does our host fee look like and what is our revenue sharing fee potentially going to look like and what are we diverting away from disposal to our landfill. We tried to make projections. Keep in mind those are just projections, however, the bottom line is down the road if single stream recycling does take off I looked at potentially...say in Year 10 of this program if we are able to increase our recycling participation by 30% or more and are able to take 30% out of landfilling it, that is about \$1.5 million that we will be saving. So

this partnership that we are developing or proposing to develop with Corcoran is addressing the issues that we had with full level services and addressing the fact that it pays for us to increase our participation because we get the benefit of revenue sharing and diversion from the landfill. It makes what we feel is a win-win situation for the City of Manchester. Single stream recycling, you probably haven't heard a lot about that but I think you will hear more and more in the years to come because it is quite frankly a no-brainer. You have that one bin and you put all of your materials in it. You don't have to wrap and bundle your newspapers separately. In addition, Goffstown has just gone to single stream recycling. They experienced a tremendous increase in their recycling. Having said that I will turn to my two colleagues here and see if there is anything they want to add or we can open it up for questions. Before we end this I would like to introduce the owners of Corcoran Environmental so you can match a face to the proposal.

Chairman Roy stated Frank you can go ahead and introduce Patrick and Fred.

Mr. Thomas stated Patrick Corcoran is the guy who is going to sign the contract.

Mr. Patrick Corcoran stated I am the owner of Corcoran Environmental Services, I also own a real estate company. With me is the Director of Municipal Operations, Ed Infrere. Ed is a resident here in Manchester, and another one of my employees is a resident of Hudson. Quick story, been in the business about 13 years, started my own company about nine years ago. Right now my company markets managers and brokers about 800 tractor trailer loads of material per month, so we are quite literally moving a lot of material out of New England to end facilities both in New England and overseas into the export market. Large brokerage and we have relationships with some large end facilities that will guarantee our movement of material which is critical when setting up our operation. Just rough numbers last year we did just shy of 90,000 tons of material to market, and again I'd welcome any questions or thoughts and I greatly appreciate all of the work that the city of Manchester's staff has done looking out for your interest looking out for every penny they can in negotiations.

Mr. Thomas stated before you open it for questions, there was a couple of other points I wanted to touch on. The agreement and lease agreement that you have copies of they are not 100 percent final. We have been working with the City Solicitor's office the basic content of these agreements are fine but I don't want you to think that they are 100 percent finalized. Hopefully by the time it goes to the Board we'll get a little bit closer, our recommendation for tonight and next Monday would be to approve it subject to the City Solicitor crossing the t's and dotting the i's, but the substance of these agreements are fine. One other issue that I think is very important this agreement calls for Corcoran Environmental to put

up a \$5 million performance bond to guarantee the collection and processing of both yard waste recyclables. We do have a letter from their bonding company stating that they have that capacity to be bonded. Again, just a little bit more insurance on the City side.

Alderman Thibault stated I have two questions. This \$2.50 per ton for both cities and towns you said Frank.

Mr. Thomas responded yes, this is going to be a regional facility where not only will materials collected in Manchester be taken to that site to be processed, but for example Goffstown most likely will want to bring there materials to that site. So for every ton of materials that comes from outside of the city we will receive \$2.50 a ton as a host fee.

Alderman Thibault asked if that we including our.

Mr. Thomas responded no it isn't. It's just the host.

Alderman Thibault said so just from other towns and cities.

Mr. Thomas replied that is correct.

Alderman Thibault stated didn't I here you say that over a certain tonnage we would start getting.

Mr. Thomas replied that host fee will go up if Cocoran starts charging more for the other towns to tip at that facility. So it starts off at \$2.50 but may go up from there.

Mr. Thomas noted that the second revenue stream is based on total tonnage. The revenue sharing is based on the total tons that go through the facility which includes ours.

Alderman Thibault asked the toters you talked about, who's going to pay for the toters.

Mr. Thomas replied the toters, well ultimately we pay for everything, because it was a contract with the City. What the proposal or contract calls for is for Cocoran to buy the toters and there would be a pass through cost plus a 10 percent mark up.

Alderman Thibault stated to the homeowners you mean.

Mr. Thomas replied no to us, under the contract, that would include the distributing, purchasing, etc. so it's basically a pass through cost.

Alderman Forest stated the only concern I have and I mentioned it to Patrick so we could maybe get an answer but when they build the facility or when they start building the facility Black Brook runs right behind or west of where that building is going to be and the concern I have is to make sure they safeguard the brook itself and what they plan on doing to safeguard that so if there are high winds or anything stuff won't go into the brook and down the river.

Mr. Thomas responded that will be a concern of ours also. We will keep an eye on the design of that facility. I would think that the structure they are building, most of the tipping and transfer will be done inside the facility. It is not like the papers and stuff will be outside. It should be all enclosed. But it will be items like that and noise will be all an issue that we closely monitor.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a few questions. For what you reference as Phase I we will continue to use the bins we currently have?

Mr. Thomas responded that is correct. We may have to add to them if we see the participation rate increase but for two years while we are still doing dual stream the bins that we have will be used.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a recommendation on the education program. Hopefully there is an emphasis in the schools because I think the kids seem to drive parent behavior sometimes.

Mr. Thomas responded the proposal does recognize...there is a paragraph in the contract stating that schools are a key in the overall education program, including the media, etc.

Alderman O'Neil asked the penalty of up to \$1,000 a day and I am very optimistic as you are that we won't see that in this contract but do we hold payment. Is that what we do?

Mr. Thomas responded what we would do is deduct it from payment due.

Alderman O'Neil asked yard waste collection – Christmas trees. Is that something we will pay an additional...I notice an additional week is \$15,000/week?

Mr. Thomas answered no that is included in the base price for yard waste collection. What we have done again this time around is built in a mechanism so that...in one respect we are lucky we got the snow early because that stopped

people from raking their yards but in the past when we have had a late snow season quite frankly we have had quite a bit of yard waste generated after the cut off date. We do have a mechanism where we can tell them to add on another week.

Alderman O'Neil asked so that is our call about adding on the week.

Mr. Thomas answered it is our call but obviously we would have to pay for it.

Alderman O'Neil stated Frank in a conversation with you my opinion is there is a budget shortfall this year to pay for the contract through June 30.

Mr. Thomas responded that is correct. We are looking at approximately a \$225,000 shortfall. Now we have had discussions with Finance and the Mayor's office and the way we are going to be handling that is we are going to see how we make it through the winter and hopefully come spring we will have some extra money and be able to make that shortfall up. If not, there are other reserves that we will look at. We will be closely monitoring our operating budget with Finance and the Mayor's office.

Alderman O'Neil asked what would be the expected budget number for FY07. It might be in here and I just missed it.

Mr. Thomas answered we are looking at \$916,494 plus \$770,000 x 103%. That is about \$1.659 million.

Alderman O'Neil responded it can't be that.

Mr. Thomas replied approximately \$1.7 million. We will definitely give you the correct number for the budget process.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to commend you and your staff. I know you put a lot of time and effort into this. We wrote the extensions under the Waste Management Agreement as long as we could but to be honest with you the service just wasn't that great.

Mr. Thomas responded it was not only our department. The Finance Department has also been actively involved in this as well as the Solicitor's Office.

Alderman O'Neil stated well done to all.

Mr. Thomas stated Alderman Roy has also been actively involved in the process.

Alderman O'Neil stated well thank you all very much.

Chairman Roy stated Patrick had a question going back to Alderman Forest's building question and then I will go to Alderman Lopez.

Mr. Corcoran stated Alderman Forest your question concerning Black Brook was...what we are looking at building is a EPA green leads facility. This classification is environmentally safe, sound facility. There are less than five in the country in the solid waste management field, so we will be working with DEP and ProCon here in town that we have met with as far as building at a site that is very environmentally friendly, it will be part of getting this building up to speed in the certification process.

Alderman DeVries stated I am asking about the Greenfield facility. You said there were five in the country. The facility in Auburn, do you know if that happened to fall within that category?

Mr. Corcoran responded to our knowledge no.

Alderman DeVries asked so what you are saying is there will be additional protections above and beyond what we see over in Auburn that will guarantee the waste doesn't move around and pollute the environment.

Mr. Corcoran answered absolutely.

Alderman Lopez stated I spoke to Frank Thomas today so I am not going to bore everybody with a lot of questions but I would like to know...in downtown toter collection where there is no recycling and you have a 10 year contract if we open up that contract to make it recycling in businesses downtown as so stated in the contract what happens.

Mr. Thomas responded we already have a bid price to do recycling in the downtown area. That was part of the proposal. We do have a price. We can amend the contract. It is not like opening up the entire contract. It would be an amendment to the contract to provide collection in the downtown.

Alderman Lopez asked so that would be an additional \$98,000 if we did that

Mr. Thomas answered yes but I imagine when we start negotiating that it will be \$98,000+.

Alderman Lopez stated you mentioned a \$5 million bond. If the owners fail to secure a 30-year funding package would that \$5 million bond kick in?



Mr. Thomas stated the contract provides that they have to have the facility up and running by the end of the third year. There are penalties if that doesn't happen.

Alderman Lopez responded it is Item 9 that I am looking at.

Mr. Thomas stated if they are not up and running by March 1, 2009 they will be paying the City \$5,000/month until the facility is up and running and the performance job, yes, could be utilized to guarantee that as part of their performance.

Alderman Lopez stated on Item 15 as we discussed right now the difference between what we are paying is \$1.659 or \$1.7 million in the FY07 budget is that correct.

Mr. Thomas responded well no. Keep in mind that the numbers that we identified to you, the \$770,000 for yard waste and the \$889,800 that is for year one and the contract starts March 1. So the majority of the FY07 budget would have that number included.

Alderman Lopez asked on the \$39,000 that we get in the third year we will increase that in the fifth year or sixth year – the 3%.

Mr. Thomas answered in the sixth year it goes up 3% and then every third year after that.

Alderman DeVries asked have you prepared something like a GPS that shows us the approximate layout on where you envision the facility within your property.

Mr. Thomas answered yes we do have something.

Chairman Roy asked can a reduced copy of that be made available to the full Board.

Mr. Thomas answered yes it is going to be an attachment to the contract agreement but if you know the drop-off area where the white goods pile is located that is basically going to be the location of the building. What is shown on that plan shows half the area on the high plateau and half the area on the low plateau. I think we will be working with Corcoran to try to keep it on one level up there. I don't think they want a split-level facility and I don't think they want to fill in 25 or 30'.

Alderman DeVries asked could you speak to the circulation on the site. Do you anticipate using the existing road infrastructure to bring the trucks in?

Mr. Thomas answered no. The existing circulation will be in at the scale that is there now because all of this material has got to be weighed up so the circulation...

Alderman DeVries interjected is that down here. So you will be using the existing Dunbarton Road up to the existing paved...

Mr. Thomas interjected that is correct.

Alderman DeVries asked do you have anything prepared that might show us what the façade would look like approximately. Are we probably talking a large metal structure?

Mr. Thomas answered yes. Quite frankly, I don't believe Corcoran is that far along yet but it will be most likely a manufactured type metal structure.

Alderman DeVries stated I realize we are out of landfill so it is not incredibly impertinent I was just curious. I do have a few other questions. Since you will be bringing the trucks, not only Manchester but other towns, past the animal shelter and I know the animal shelter has an existing concern that they have no outdoor pet exercise area...they exercise their pets on leash and they have been working on a way to find an area with the grade issues that they have there so they can build some sort of an area to exercise their pets. I would ask that you look to that because they are going to be on-site working with the grade issues there that we build up or whatever we have to do to accommodate some sort of secure area for the exercise. I realize that others may not look at this as a priority but that is a non-profit that saves us tens of thousands of dollars in tax revenue dollars every year and I think the least we can do is look to accommodate them while we are there working on site before we bring in a lot of additional truck traffic into that area if that is possible.

Mr. Thomas responded yes we will take a look at their existing site. Again, where they abut that large hole I am not sure if we are going to be able to raise it up but we may be able to utilize some of the property that exists to the east of their site.

Alderman DeVries stated I know they have been looking to expand their facility so I am sure they would entertain a conversation on how that would work. Could you get some feedback back to me so that I know where those conversations have gone after you have had them?

Mr. Thomas replied certainly.

Alderman DeVries stated on a different note the penalty piece of the contract, you indicate that there is a \$1,000 penalty, which you feel is substantial. That is per incident though?

Mr. Thomas responded it is \$100 per residence up to \$1,000 per day.

Alderman DeVries stated and I am just trying to envision because I know it didn't happen all that frequently but there were occasions where entire segments of the City, the entire South end or North end were left off pick-up and \$1,000 to me if they are missing say 1,000 homes that to me doesn't sound like a big...to me they would save money if they...

Mr. Thomas interjected it is a big number if you have to pay it. I understand where you are coming from. It could have been \$10/stop or something like that but what we wanted to do was get it up to a reasonable maximum as quickly as possible. As I mentioned, I would like to think that we are not going to have those types of problems but if we do \$1,000 will get their attention pretty quickly.

Alderman DeVries asked is it possible to build something in that in case it is a large scale where economically they are saving money but not doing say 1,000 residences for pick-up just to make sure that you have hit that threshold where it actually is costing them more to pay the penalty than they are saving and their not having two trucks out picking up in a given day.

Mr. Thomas answered we can go back and talk to them. I am not sure if they are going to be willing to increase the penalty or potential penalty. Again, we feel that that is very severe. When you are looking at 10 houses potentially being missed...yes I understand your concern if it is an entire area of the City. They still have to meet their obligations so if there is an entire area and it goes for two or three days and is missed that is \$1,000/day.

Alderman DeVries asked and you still feel that is substantial and just remember that that did occur not this summer that I am aware of but the summer before on several occasions where large segments or an entire quadrant was not addressed and it took well over a week or two weeks to correct that.

Mr. Thomas answered again at \$1,000/day that is going to add up quickly. I, quite frankly, think that it is more than adequate compared to what we had. In addition as I mentioned I don't feel that we are going to have to draw on this penalty because again the resources are going to be out there. On Day 1 we are looking at an extra truck and crew out there. In addition, the base workday is a 10-hour day

so you add the longer workday and the additional equipment and I don't see a problem.

Mr. Corcoran stated first things first. My reputation and my company's reputation are at stake in servicing the City of Manchester. We currently service close to 200 municipalities now so my reputation and the company's reputation is to service the customer or the resident. Secondly, I want that material. There is not really a benefit to pay \$1,000 when I need that material to operate the facility. Thirdly, I also have the bond backside so if that \$1,000 is not satisfactory what is going to happen is that we are going to have a see through contract with Pinard and those penalties will end up hitting Pinard if they fail to do the work that we have asked them to do. So there are three separate things. There is my reputation, there is a see through contract that you folks will end up seeing that will be signed with Pinard and I need the material to be very frank.

Alderman DeVries stated I apologize for not being 100% comfortable with that. You have to understand that it didn't work so well for us last time with another company's reputation on the line as well. Enough said on that. I think finally and I think you just led to this for me since you are in pursuit of, if you will, recyclables and that the increased number of recyclables is a good thing I am wondering why within this plan we don't have anything to address the private roads, the other planned unit developments and such that are springing up throughout the City. Those homeowners that are still paying the full tax dollars but aren't included in this plan today. Maybe that is something that you could address with the company because I think many of these you could incorporate into recycling.

Mr. Thomas responded I think down the road once we can clearly show that there is a profit to be made...on Day 1 it is still costing us money to recycle. We don't reach that break even point...if we come to a point where the product is worth more than the cost of collection and processing then we would certainly look at the private developments.

Alderman DeVries stated I think we need to include it in this contract if we are going to include private businesses in the downtown area for recyclables. I think the City could be opening up as the state of Massachusetts found when they collect full taxes and don't provide equivalent services there is potential for some lawsuits there and I think you ought to look at that a little bit more.

Mr. Thomas replied we have the ability to add trucks but again in talking to the Assessor's Office supposedly the assessment for condominiums and other private residences reflect the fact that in some cases they are not getting all of the same

services such as private roads, private pump station and not collecting recyclables. That is the opinion that we have gotten from the Assessor's Office in the past.

Alderman DeVries asked you are bringing on private businesses downtown though and I think that changes the scenario a little bit where we are working to include one segment of the private tax base to the exclusion of another. I think that really needs to be addressed if we can within the terms of this contract and not waiting to see for another day.

Mr. Thomas answered we have the ability again to add additional men and equipment on. If the Board of Mayor and Aldermen desires at some time in the future that we move into that private area and is willing to pay for that service we would be more than glad to do it and I am sure that Corcoran Environmental would be willing to do that.

Alderman Forest stated I believe and I wasn't paying attention at the beginning but I believe, Alderman DeVries, you were talking about the dog pound and their extension that they want to build. The animal shelter, I'm sorry. In speaking with some of the people down there and again it has been awhile since they first proposed that they wanted to build an addition and I know they haven't talked to any architects or anything yet but their provision for building the addition is not a large one and there is plenty of room back there in sort of the northwest of where their building is compared to where Corcoran is going to build theirs. There is plenty of room there to build an addition if they need to or if they want to.

Alderman DeVries responded I can see from the site plan that it is not going to preclude them from expanding should they wish to. That wasn't the concern I had. The concern I had was that we somehow accommodate them to get a secure area where they can exercise their pets. They don't have that today and they walk the dogs that they bring in on leash and as we bring all of the new trucks onto the road I think it is only fair that we support that non-profit that saves us tens of thousands of dollars by building something that is a little bit secure on that side of the road.

Alderman O'Neil stated I appreciate the concerns and I think I want to make Alderman Gatsas' life a little easier when he goes home tonight on that issue to make sure that everything is fine regarding the animal shelter. Frank, just to summarize this whole thing we have talked about the cost and the proposal is from Day 1 the collection will be the same day as your trash pick-up?

Mr. Thomas responded yes for recycling and yard waste.

Alderman O'Neil asked and with the current contract we have three trucks we think picking up recycling...

Mr. Thomas interjected on the best day.

Alderman O'Neil stated and this is a guaranteed four trucks.

Mr. Thomas responded yes four trucks on Day 1.

Alderman O'Neil asked and on yard waste it could vary anywhere from two to four.

Mr. Thomas answered no it starts off with four trucks...

Alderman O'Neil interjected I am talking about the existing contract, which is two to four and this guarantees a minimum of four.

Mr. Thomas replied that is correct.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault it was voted to approve the contract and send it to the full Board subject to review by the City Solicitor.

#### **TABLED ITEM**

4. Communication from Arline Parent relative to concerns regarding yard waste collection.  
(Tabled 09/13/2005)

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to remove this item from the table.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault it was voted to receive and file this item.

There being further business, on motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee